



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/614,468	07/07/2003	Michael Yeh	251807-1010	7633	
24504 7	590 01/28/2005		EXAMINER		
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP			BASTIANELLI, JOHN		
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			3751		

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/614,46	314,468 YEH, MICHAEL					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		John Bast	ianelli	3751				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication	tion appears on the	cov r sheet with th	orrespondence address				
THE - Exte efter - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no eve cation. ays, a reply within the statu my period will apply and will by statute, cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) days I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from t cation to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
_								
1)[\]	Responsive to communication(s) filed o	_						
2a)∐ 3)□								
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) is/are objected to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the E The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objectio Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	) accepted or b)[ on to the drawing(s) be e correction is require	e held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		,					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachmen	at(s)							
1) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	• • •	4) Interview Summary					
3) 🛛 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/27/04</u> .		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Species I of Figs. 1A-1B pertaining to claims 1-5 in the reply filed on December 27, 2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). The examiner would like to thank the applicant for calling to clarify the restriction requirement as the examiner mistakenly used the claim #'s instead of the figure #'s in the restriction requirement of November 29, 2004.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2.

Trost discloses a pressure regulating device for a container 11 in which gas is contained, the container having a vent hole 13 through which the gas is vented, the pressure-regulating device having an electrical control unit 22 for outputting a voltage; a deformable member 21 coupled to the electrical control unit, wherein the voltage causes the deformable member to generate a corresponding deformation; and an adjustment member 21b disposed on the deformable member and opposite to the vent hole, wherein the deformation causes the adjustment member to

Art Unit: 3751

generate a corresponding displacement, and causes the vent hole to open or close according to the displacement of the adjustment member so that the interior pressure of the container may be regulated. The deformable member is seen as a piezoelectric sheet.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 3, and alternatively 2, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2 in view of Lazarus et al. US 6,024,340.

Trost lacks a laminated piezoelectric sheet. Lazarus discloses a laminated piezoelectric sheet (col. 5, lines 13-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the piezoelectric deformable member of Trost into a laminated piezoelectric sheet as disclosed by Lazarus in order to provide "a unitized and unitary stiff but flexible laminated sheet assembly".

6. Claim 4, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2 in view of Weber et al. US 5,880,752.

Trost lacks a bi-metallic deformable member. Weber discloses using a bi-metallic member (col. 5, lines 19-25) as the deformable member. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the piezoelectric deformable member

Art Unit: 3751

of Trost into a bimetallic sheet as disclosed by Weber in order to provide a cheaper apparatus in which to make the valve (bimetallic strips are common in thermostats).

7. Claim 5, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2 in view of Biegelsen et al. US 6,123,316.

Trost lacks a memorizing alloy deformable member. Biegelsen discloses the equivalency of piezoelectric and shape memory alloy (SMA) deformable members (col. 8, lines 9-29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the piezoelectric deformable member of Trost into a memorizing alloy deformable member as disclosed by Biegelsen as memorizing alloys provide a quicker response time.

#### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Miyazoe discloses laminated piezoelectric. Talbot discloses the equivalency of using piezoelectric and bimetallic members. Ito discloses a shape memorizing alloy. Frick, Jacobsson, Bouchard, Castle, and Lloyd disclose piezoelectric pressure regulating valves. Russell, Sulatisky, Nusz, and Surjaatmadja disclose pressure regulating valves controlled by an electronic unit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Bastianelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-4921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:30).

Art Unit: 3751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John Bastianelli Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3751

∥ JB

January 26, 2005